REMARKS

This paper responds to the Office Action mailed on <u>March 14, 2006</u>.

None of the claims are amended, canceled, or added. Claims 1-56 remain pending in this application.

§*102 Rejection of the Claims*

Claims 1-14, 17-19, 24-35, 37-38 and 40-56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) for anticipation by Royer (U.S. 6,961,269). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Regarding claim 1, Applicant is unable to find in Royer everything recited in claim 1. For example, Applicant is unable to find in Royer a memory array for storing memory data, a conditioning data storage unit for "storing conditioning data", a data selection circuit connected to the memory array and the conditioning data storage unit for "selecting data between the memory data and the conditioning data", and a data transceiver circuit connected to the data selection circuit for outputting to the data lines "the data selected by the data selection circuit".

Applicant believes that Royer teaches different things. Royer teaches in FIG. 7 a compression/decompression (C/D) engine 716 in a data path 111 for compressing and decompressing data before or after the data is transferred between data path 111 and a memory array 102 (Royer, column 10, lines 1-9). The Office Action compares C/D engine 716 of Royer to the conditioning data storage unit of claim 1. However, Applicant is unable to find in Royer a teaching or fair suggestion that C/D engine 716 of Royer is for storing data, such as the conditioning data, as recited in claim 1.

Royer also teaches two data paths 111 and 122 (FIG. 1) for transferring data to and from memory array 102. Based on certain operating mode of the device of Royer, a path selector 121 (FIG. 1) of the device of Royer selects which one of the data paths 111 and 122 to transfer the data between memory array 102 and the selected data path (Royer, column 2, lines 49-51, and column 14, lines 58-62). The Office Action compares path selector 121 of Royer to the data selection circuit of claim 1. However, as discussed herein, path selector 121 of Royer is for selecting a *path* (not data) to transfer data between the selected path and memory array 102. Applicant is unable to find in Royer a teaching or fair suggestion that path selector 121 of Royer is for "selecting data between the memory data and the conditioning data", as recited in claim 1.

Royer further teaches in FIG. 1 a data transceiver circuit 127 for transferring data between data path 122 and memory array 102 (Royer, column 6, line 61 to column 7 line 13). The Office Action compares data transceiver circuit 127 of Royer to the data transceiver circuit of claim 1. As discussed above, the Office Action also compares C/D engine 176 of Royer to the conditioning data storage unit of claim 1 and path selector 121 of Royer to the data selection circuit of claim 1. Thus, even if path selector 121 of Royer can somehow select data from C/D engine 716, Applicant is unable to find in Royer a teaching or fair suggestion that data transceiver circuit 127 is for outputting to data lines 128 data in which the data outputting to data lines 128 is the data selected between C/D engine 716 and memory array 102 of by path selector 121. In contrast to Royer, claim 1 recites that the data transceiver circuit is for outputting to the data lines "the data selected by the data 1selection circuit".

Based on all of the discussion above, Applicant believes that claim 1 is not anticipated by Royer. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claims 1 and its dependent claims.

Regarding claim 7, Applicant is unable to find in Royer everything recited in claim 7. For example, Applicant is unable to find in Royer a conditioning data storage unit for storing conditioning data, a plurality of multiplexers, "each" of the multiplexers including a first input node connected to the output data path, a second input node connected to the conditioning data storage unit, and an multiplexing output node, a plurality of data transceivers, "each" of the data transceivers connecting between the multiplexing output node and one of the data lines. Royer teaches in FIG. 1, FIG. 2, and FIG. 7 an input select circuit 704, an output select circuit 706, C/D engine 716, a data path 111, a plurality of data transceivers 162-0 to 162-n, and data lines 182. The Office Action compares these elements of Royer to the multiplexers, the data conditioning storage unit, output data path, the data transceivers, and the data lines of claim 1. However, as shown in FIG. 1, FIG. 2, and FIG. 7 of Royer, Applicant is unable to find that *each* of the input select circuit 704 and output select circuit 706 of Royer has first and second input nodes and an output node that are connected with other elements of Royer in the same way that "each" of the multiplexers of claim 1 is connected with other elements of claim 1. Thus, Applicant believes that claim 7 is not anticipated by Royer. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claims 7 and its dependent claims.

Regarding claim 14, for at least the reasons presented in claim 7, Applicant is unable to find in Royer everything recited in claim 14. For example, Applicant is unable to find in Royer a plurality of multiplexers, "each" of the multiplexers including a first input node connected to the output data path, a second input node connected to the storage node, and an multiplexing output node, a plurality of data transceivers, "each" of the data transceivers connecting between the multiplexing output node and one of the data lines. Thus, Applicant believes that claim 14 is not anticipated by Royer. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claims 14 and its dependent claims.

Regarding claim 19, for at least the reasons presented in claim 1, Applicant is unable to find in Royer everything recited in claim 19. For example, Applicant is unable to find in Royer a memory array for storing memory data, a conditioning data storage unit for "storing conditioning data", a data selection circuit connected to the memory array and the conditioning data storage unit for "selecting data between the memory data and the conditioning data", and a data transceiver circuit connected to the data selection circuit for outputting to the data lines "the data selected by the data selection circuit". Thus, Applicant believes that claim 19 is not anticipated by Royer. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claims 19 and its dependent claims.

Regarding claim 28, Applicant is unable to find in Royer everything recited in claim 28. For example, Applicant is unable to find in Royer "outputting a conditioning data to the data line during the latency time interval" and "outputting the memory data to the data line after the latency time". Thus, Applicant believes that claim 28 is not anticipated by Royer. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claims 28 and its dependent claims.

Regarding claim 37, Applicant is unable to find in Royer everything recited in claim 37. For example, Applicant is unable to find in Royer "transferring a conditioning bit from a conditioning data storage unit to a data line at a first signal transition of the strobe signal after the command signal is issued" and "transferring the memory data from the memory array to the data line after the transferring of the conditioning bit". Thus, Applicant believes that claim 37 is not anticipated by Royer. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claims 37 and its dependent claims.

Regarding claim 41, Applicant is unable to find in Royer everything recited in claim 41. For example, Applicant is unable to find in Royer "transferring a conditioning data from a conditioning data storage unit to a data line during a conditioning time interval after the command signal is issued" and "transferring a memory data from a memory array to the data line after the conditioning time interval". Thus, Applicant believes that claim 41 is not anticipated by Royer. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claims 41 and its dependent claims.

Regarding claim 51, Applicant is unable to find in Royer everything recited in claim 51. For example, Applicant is unable to find in Royer "transferring a conditioning data from a conditioning data storage unit to the data transceiver based on a first state of a data enable signal", "outputting the conditioning data from the data transceiver to a data line during the conditioning time interval", "transferring a memory data from a memory array to the data transceiver based on a second state of the data enable signal", and "outputting the memory data from the data transceiver to the data line after the conditioning time interval". Thus, Applicant believes that claim 51 is not anticipated by Royer. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claims 51 and its dependent claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 15-16, 20-23, 36 and 39 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 15-16, 20-23, 36 and 39 depend from independent claims 14, 19, 28, and 37. As discussed above, Applicant believes that claims 14, 19, 28, and 37 are not anticipated by Royer. Thus, Applicant also believes that claims 15-16, 20-23, 36 and 39 are not anticipated by Royer. Accordingly, Applicant believes that claims 15-16, 20-23, 36 and 39 are allowable as written in the current dependent form.

RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR § 1.111
Serial Number: 10/789,190
Filing Date: February 27, 2004
Title: MEMORY DEVICE HAVING CONDITIONING OUTPUT DATA

Page 15
Dkt: 303.878US1

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (612) 373-6969 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

EBRAHIM H HARGAN

By his Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 373-6969

Date   14 June 2006   By _____
                              Viet V. Tong
                              Reg. No. 45,416

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being filed using the USPTO's electronic filing system EFS-Web, and is addressed to: Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this _14_ day of June, 2006.

_____   _____
Name   Signature